

REMARKS

On further consideration of this case, it has been recognized that the indication in claim 16 that the shape of the first overlapping non-conductive areas of the first and third layers perpendicular to lamination direction were different was not correct because if the margins of the area are defined by the overlap, the shapes must be the same. Accordingly, the word "overlapping" should be deleted.

As described and shown in the application, the configuration of non-conductive areas of the first and third layers perpendicular to lamination direction are different although portions overlap in the lamination direction so as to form inductive areas. To reflect this, the language of claim 16 (after deletion of the word "overlapping") has been incorporated into independent claim 7. It also meant the "at least a portion" recitation was not correct and they have been deleted in claims 7 and 14. Rather than cancel claim 16, it has been changed to refer to both the first and second non-conductive areas.

The rejection of claim 7, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Hiratsuka is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 calls for a stepped impedance structured resonator which is a laminate having a set of three layers, the middle layer being a dielectric. Each outer layers includes a pair of spaced areas which are non-conductive with a conductive area between the non-

conductive areas. The configuration of the non-conductive/conductive areas in the pair of layers are different. The two outer layers are positioned such that a portion of each non-conductive area in one outer layer overlaps a portion of the corresponding non-conductive area in the other outer layer in the lamination direction, and the resulting juxtaposition of two non-conductive areas with dielectric between them results in the formation of an inductive area. In addition, a portion of the conductive areas in the two outer layers overlap each other with the dielectric layer positioned between them to form a capacitive area. This construction is not taught (or suggested) by the Hiratsuka reference.

In the reference, the configuration of the pair of outer layers are the same in all embodiments. The circular openings 22a are positioned so as to be directly opposite one another. Likewise, when the both outer layers contain non-electrode coupling parts 25a, they have the same configuration and oppose each other although the rectangular shape shown in Figures 1 and 2 is not mandatory and the size, shape and location can be changed as desired (column 3, lines 47-53).

The difference between the configurations of the invention and Hiratsuka gives rise to significant consequences. In Hiratsuka, the configuration of the slots is fixed whereas in the invention the configuration can be easily changed by changing just one conductive layer. As a result, there is a great latitude in designing a resonator to satisfy a

multitude of varying specifications. In addition, the step ratio can be easily increased and the resonator miniaturized.

The Section 103 rejection is based on Hiratsuka to show the resonator and another reference to show stacking. Since Hiratsuka fails to teach or suggest the resonator of the claims under consideration, the combination cannot render those claims obvious.

In light of the foregoing considerations, it is respectfully submitted that all rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed.

Dated: May 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman/
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant